

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

STEVEN W. KRAFCHICK,


Petitioner.

v.

ELIZABETH BURRIS, Acting Warden,
and JOSEPH R. BIDEN, III, Attorney
General of the State of Delaware,

Respondents.

Civil Action No. 07-284-GMS



BP 5/2/08

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Pursuant to Rule 6 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, petitioner moves for an extension of time in which to file a reply to the defendants answer brief. In support thereof, petitioner states the following:

1. The petitioner, Steven W. Krafchick, has applied for federal habeas relief in the District Court for the District of Delaware and is currently an inmate and incarcerated at the Delaware Department of Corrections Delaware Correctional Center located in Smyrna, Delaware.
2. The petitioner was served by the mail room of the (DOC) December 10, 2007 and has not had an opportunity to utilize the law library until today Monday, December 17, 2007.

In determining whether to grant petitioner an extension of time to serve defendants, a District Court should examine a two-step procedure.

First, the District Court should determine whether "good cause" exist for an extension of time. If good cause is present, the District court must extend time for service and inquiry is discharge. If however, good cause does not exist, the court in its discretion decides whether to dismiss the motion for the extension of the time for service or make other allowances as deemed appropriate by its authority.

The Third Circuit Court has defined "good cause" as being tantamount to "excusable neglect" under Rule 6 (b) pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures. The Third Circuit further explains factors that were relevant to evaluate a claim and to determine whether it was excusable neglect. 1) Whether the inadvertence reflected professional incompetence such as ignorance of rules of procedure, in considering the following, the record should reflect that the petitioner has had no formal training in the area of Federal Law and its procedures. 2) The court should also take in to account that even those among the legal profession have difficulty from time to time in this area of 28 § 2254 legal proceedings which deal with Habeas Corpus Relief. 3) The petitioner submits, that it is not a lack of diligence on the petitioner part. 4) The petitioner is diligently research and trying to prepare his reply brief to the defendants answering brief. 5) Due to the restrictions placed on the petitioner to utilize the law library at the place of confinement, is has hindered the petitioner's efforts to prepare his reply brief in a timely manner. The District Court should in addition, take into account that this motion is being presented in "good faith" and should not bring any unfair advantage or disadvantage to either side and is unavoidable. The petitioner is not fully relieved of his duty to serve defendants and understands that (Pro-se) status does not eliminate the petitioners' duties in this case, however, it would be

practical and judicial and better serve the interest of justice if the petitioner's motion were granted extended time for service.

In support of this motion, the petitioner offers the following:


1. The petitioner while diligently preparing his reply brief discovered that the record sent to the District Court in incomplete.
2. The petitioner only gets between 3-5hrs on two days at the law library.
3. The petitioner is currently working on his last two answers to his reply brief.

In conclusion, it is beyond the control of the petitioner to get enough time to prepare his reply brief, therefore, the petitioner prays that this Court will grant this motion and allow the petitioner the much-needed time to prepare his response.

This is the petitioner's second and last request for an extension of time pursuant to Rule 6 of the Federal rules of civil Procedures.

Petitioner submits that an extension of time to and including January 24, 2008 would give sufficient time to finish preparing the petitioner's response. Petitioner submits herewith a proposed order.


Dated: January 8, 2008


Steven W. Krafchick (Pro-se)
Delaware Correctional Center
1181 Paddock Road
Smyrna, DE 19977

RULE 7.1.1 CERTIFICATION

I herby certify that I have neither sought nor obtained the consent of the defendants, who works in the Department of Justice Attorney Generals Office due to time restraints on the petitioner at this time to the subject matter of this motion.

Dated: January 8, 2008



Steven W. Krafchick (Pro-se)
Delaware Correctional Center
1181 Paddock Road
Smyrna, DE 19977


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 8, 2008, I Steven W. Krafchick have generated a true and correct copy of the petitioner's motion for extension of time and served said copies upon the following parties/person(s):

To: Elizabeth R. McFarlin
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
820 N. French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(Attorney for Defendants)
ELIZABETH BURRIS, Acting Warden,
and JOSEPH R. BIDEN, III, Attorney
General of the State of Delaware.

To: Clerk of Court
Peter T. Dalleo
United States District Court
844 King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

BY PLACING SAME in a sealed envelope and placing same in the United States Mail at the Delaware Correctional Center, 1181 Paddock Road, Smyrna, DE 19977 on this 8th day of the month of January 2008.




Steven W. Krafchick (Pro-se)
Delaware Correctional Center
1181 Paddock Road
Smyrna, DE 19977

IM Steven W. Kroschick
SBI# 178856 UNIT V-Ridey
DELAWARE CORRECTIONAL CENTER
1181 PADDOCK ROAD
SMYRNA, DELAWARE 19977

U.S.M.S.
X-RAY

WILMINGTON DE 197
09 JAN 2008 PM 3 T



Clerk of Court (Peter T. Dalkeo)
United States District Court
844 King Street, Lockbox 18
Wilmington, Delaware
19801

*Legal Mail

19801+3513 0012